

Comparison of Different Staff Approaches to Completing DDS Assessment Tool (SIS)

DRAFT V1 1.8.2019

Purpose:

The table below compares different approaches to completing assessments that inform funding for DDS HCBS services. This comparison assumes that the assessment instrument will be the SIS with supplemental questions. This comparison does not directly address the development of a person-centered plan.

Criteria:

The table below uses criteria that were initially generated at a meeting of DAIL staff. The criteria and the table merit further review by a broader group of stakeholders.

Ratings:

Ratings reflect the content of each assessment approach related to the stated criteria. The ratings do not directly address the needs assessment tool itself, or a resource allocation process that may be developed to use the assessment information.

Rating key:

- 0 – does not meet criteria
- 1 – somewhat meets criteria
- 2 – mostly meets criteria
- 3 – completely meets the criteria

Criteria	DA/SSA provider staff	DAIL staff	Contractors (RFP)	Other state staff	ACO staff
Allows for viewpoints from multiple people vs. single viewpoint	2	3			
Allows for individualization (person-centered)	3	3			
Well trained in SIS	3	3			
Validity and reliability enhanced by limited number of assessors	?	3			3
Objective; reduces unnecessary subjectivity	1	3			
Cost of licenses (fewer assessors = lower costs)	?	3			
Supports consistent/equitable determination of level of need/support	2	3			
Approach is used by other states	0	3			
Conflict of interest: reduces conflict of interest, complies with CMS conflict-free case management requirements	0	3			
Assessor knows the person well; assessment informed by assessor's knowledge/perception of person	2	1			
Assessor does not know the person well; assessment not influenced by assessor's knowledge/perception of person	1	3			
Person's team members can participate in assessment	3	3			
Technical Assistance needs reduced by limited number of assessors	?	3			
Costs of initial 'ramp-up' of assessors (fewer assessors = lower costs)	2	3			
Costs of ongoing assessments	2	2			
Assessment information could easily and consistently be used to determine resource allocation	1	3			
Supports equitable/fair distribution of resource across agencies and state	1	3			
Individual service choices/options are considered and supported	3	3			
Approach is consistent with values and outcomes	3	3			
Approach is similar to current approach, ie less local resistance	3	1			
Total					

DA/SSA staff

😊 Pros	Cons 😞

DAIL staff

😊 Pros	Cons 😞

Contractors

😊 Pros	Cons 😞

Other Comments/Questions: